

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 18, 2005.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed February 18, 2005, Claims 1-22 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action mailed February 18, 2005, Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ozzie et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,640,241, hereafter Ozzie).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 1 and 11, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-22. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

In the Office Action mailed February 18, 2005, Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ozzie (U.S. Patent No. 6,640,241).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended by the current Response to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *(Currently Amended) A message routing mechanism for a collaboration system that supports conversations between participants over multiple business protocols, comprising:
a central collaboration hub hosting a plurality of collaboration spaces and capable of receiving and sending messages between participants as part of a conversation between the participants,
wherein a conversation is a collective set of said messages, and*

wherein each of said collaboration spaces stores the set of messages for a particular conversation, and may be accessed by the participants using any of a plurality of business protocols, and

wherein each combination of collaboration space and business protocol is associated with a uniform resource locator that allows a participant using a particular business protocol to access a collaboration space using the uniform resource locator associated with that combination; and

a messaging protocol that allows the collaboration hub to determine the status of a conversation and its participants, wherein said messaging protocol provides an ability to specify the business protocol for a given conversation.

Claim 1, as currently amended, defines a message routing mechanism comprising a central collaboration hub. The hub hosts a plurality of collaboration spaces for use in receiving and sending messages between participants as part of a conversation. Each collaboration space may be accessed by the participants using any of a plurality of business protocols. Each combination of collaboration space and business protocol is associated with a uniform resource locator that allows a participant using a particular business protocol to access a collaboration space using the uniform resource locator associated with that combination. Applicant respectfully submits that these features are not disclosed by the cited references.

Advantages of the mechanism defined by Claim 1 include that the collaboration space can support a conversation over multiple business protocols. Depending on the business protocol being used by a participant, the participant accesses the conversation space using a uniform resource locator (URL) assigned to that collaboration space/business protocol combination. When the system receives a message on the appropriate URL, it automatically knows (a) which collaboration space or conversation the message should go to, and (b) which business protocol is being used. As a result, as long as the participant uses the appropriate URL, then the system doesn't care which business protocol the participant uses.

Ozzie discloses a method and apparatus for activity-based collaboration by a computer system equipped with a communications manager. Ozzie apparently discloses a peer-to-peer communication between a number of peer units via a network. Each peer unit includes a dynamics manager for coordinating processing of deltas, and a communications manager for controlling

communication between the peer units. The responsibilities of the communications manager include transmitting and receiving messages over the network. (Column 16, lines 33-39).

Applicant respectfully submits that the communication process described in Ozzie appears to be a peer-to-peer communication, wherein each peer has a communication manager. However, in the embodiment defined by Claim 1, as currently amended, the communication between participants occurs over a central hub.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Ozzie does not appear to disclose or suggest any messaging protocol that provides an ability to specify the business protocol for a given conversation. However, in the embodiment defined by Claim 1, as currently amended, the messaging protocol provides an ability to specify the business protocol for a given conversation.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Ozzie does not appear to disclose or suggest the use of collaboration spaces, or a means to support conversations using multiple business protocols. However, in the embodiment defined by Claim 1, as currently amended, the central collaboration hub hosts a plurality of collaboration spaces, wherein each of said collaboration spaces stores the set of messages for a particular conversation, and may be accessed by the participants using any of a plurality of business protocols, and wherein each combination of collaboration space and business protocol is associated with a uniform resource locator that allows a participant using a particular business protocol to access a collaboration space using the uniform resource locator associated with that combination.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Ozzie, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 11

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claim 11 has been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 11, as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-10 and 12- 22

Claims 2-10 and 12-22 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-10 and 12- 22 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

May 18, 2005

By: _____



Karl F. Kenna

Reg. No. 45,445

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800